

REMARKS

No claims have been amended, added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-57 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13-26, 29, 31-49, 51 and 53-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 6,687,873) (hereinafter “Ballantyne”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

In regard to claim 1, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Ballantyne does not teach or suggest accessing a presentation schema in a distributed computing environment, wherein the presentation schema includes information for presenting results data for clients in the distributed computing environment, accessing results data for a client in the distributed computing environment, and presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema. Instead, Ballantyne discloses a method and system for “modifying program applications of a legacy computer system to directly output data in XML format” (emphasis added, Ballantyne, abstract). The method and system taught by Ballantyne “models the legacy computer system, maps the model to an XML schema, and automatically modifies one or more applications to directly output XML formatted data in cooperation with a writer engine and a context table” (emphasis added, Ballantyne, abstract).

Ballantyne discloses a system that modifies a legacy computer system to output data in XML format. Ballantyne’s system includes a code generation system that allows analysis of legacy program applications and generation of modified legacy program applications. After modification, the legacy applications are able to directly output syntactically correct XML data. (see, Ballantyne, column 6, lines 15-26).

In other words, Ballantyne discloses a system that changes the source code of an existing program to replace existing output commands with instructions to output XML directly. Ballantyne teaches, “[b]ased on the modification specification, code generation engine 24 generates source code in the computer language of the legacy computer system that is *inserted in legacy program applications 16* to command output of XML data and *saves the modified source code as modified legacy program applications 18*” (emphasis added, Ballantyne, column 7, lines 2-7). Thus, rather than accessing a presentation schema including information for presenting results data for clients, accessing results data for a client, and presenting the results data for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema, Ballantyne analyzes legacy program source code and modifies the source code to directly output syntactically correct XML.

The Examiner contends that Ballantyne discloses accessing results data for a client in the distributed computing environment by “allowing a user to access ‘report’ information such as invoices, billing statements, etc.” and cites column 17, lines 15-67 of Ballantyne. However, Ballantyne, at the cited reference, is describing the output from modified legacy applications, not results data *for a client*.

Furthermore, the Examiner equates the direct XML outputting from a modified legacy application with “presenting the results data from the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema.” However, Ballantyne does not teach that a modified application accesses or uses such a schema when outputting XML data. To the contrary, Ballantyne teaches the use of a schema only to determine how to modify (i.e. what commands to insert into) a legacy program in order to have the legacy application directly output XML.

For instance, Ballantyne’s code generation system analyzes a legacy application and creates a list of incidences where the legacy application outputs data. Ballantyne also discloses a mapping engine that maps the incidents to an XML schema. The mapping engine then uses the relationship between the report incidents of the legacy application

and the XML schema to define a specification for modification of the legacy applications to output XML data. (see, Ballantyne, column 6, lines 31-34 and 55-59).

Ballantyne further discloses a “[c]ode generation engine [that] accepts [a] modification specification, a copy of the legacy program applications, and [a] context table to generate modified legacy program applications” (emphasis added, column 6, line 66-column 7, line 2). Based on the modification specification, the code generation engine generates source code in the computer language of the legacy application that is inserted into the legacy applications to command output of XML data. (see, Ballantyne, column 6, line 66-column 7, line 7).

Nowhere does Ballantyne disclose *accessing a presentation schema* including information for presenting results data for clients, *accessing results data* for a client, and *presenting the results data in accordance with the information from the presentation schema*. Instead, Ballantyne discloses a system and method for *modifying* program applications of a legacy computer system to *directly* output data in XML format.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner requests that Applicants’ clarify the above argument. The Examiner equates the use of a schema that maps legacy output commands to XML output commands to modify source code as accessing a schema including information for presenting results data to present the results data and as presenting the results for the client in accordance with the information from the presentation schema. However, as pointed out above, Ballantyne’s schema does not include information for presenting results data for clients. Instead, Ballantyne uses a schema that maps one type of source code (legacy output commands) to another type of source code (XML output commands). Ballantyne’s schema is used to map legacy source code output commands to commands outputting syntactically correct XML data. Ballantyne’s schema is clearly not a presentation schema including information for presenting results data for clients. Thus, Ballantyne’s schema is not used, nor would it be usable, to present results data for a client. **Instead, Ballantyne’s schema is only usable to map, and convert, source code for applications.**

Applicants remind the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The rejection of claim 1 is clearly not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Similar arguments apply in regard to independent claims 24, 46 and 48.

In regard to claim 42, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne does not teach or suggest a service device configured to store a presentation schema advertisement on a storage device, wherein the presentation schema advertisement includes information for presenting results data produced by the service device on behalf of a client in a distributed computing system.

Instead, Ballantyne discloses a system and method for *modifying* program applications of a legacy computer system to *directly* output data in XML format, as described above. Ballantyne teaches, in columns 17-18, that this data directly outputted in XML format by a modified application may be stored on storage devices in some legacy systems. For example, Ballantyne discloses "[o]ne example is that internal reports otherwise printed on paper for manual inspection are instead available for storage on a database in XML format. Once electronically stored, the reports are available as electronic information assets for review by a browser or other electronic analysis." (Ballantyne, column 17, lines 18-23). Ballantyne's system does not include a service device configured to store a *presentation schema advertisement* that includes *information for presenting results data* produced by a service device on behalf of a client. Instead, Ballantyne discusses storing the actual results from a modified application. Nowhere does Ballantyne teach or suggest anything regarding a presentation schema advertisement. Nor does Ballantyne teach or suggest a service device configured to produce results data on behalf of a client.

In response, the Examiner contends in the Response to Arguments section, that Ballantyne teaches that “reports, billing statements, and other information can be formatted in XML can be archived in a relational database” and cites columns 17 and 18 (see, Response to Arguments, page 11, lines 7-9). The Examiner and the cited passage both refer to Ballantyne storing output from a modified legacy application in a database. However, as noted above, storing the output from a modified legacy application in a database is not the same a storage device configured to store a *presentation schema advertisement* that includes information for presenting results data produced by a service device on behalf of a client. Nowhere does Ballantyne disclose an advertisement for a presentation schema, whether on a storage device or not. Ballantyne’s system clearly does not include any such presentation schema advertisement.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 42 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 2, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Ballantyne fails to disclose a service in the distributed computing environment generating the results data prior to said accessing the results data. The Examiner refers to, without citing any particular passage, to Ballantyne’s reference to internal reports that can be stored on a database in XML format. However, the internal reports are not generated by a service prior to said accessing the results data. Instead, the reports are generated by an application modified according to Ballantyne’s system. For example, Ballantyne states, “internal reports otherwise printed on paper [by legacy application] for manual inspection are instead available for storage on a database in XML format [as output by a modified application]” (Ballantyne, column 17, lines 15-24).

Thus, rather than disclosing a service generating result data prior to accessing and presenting the results data, Ballantyne discloses only that the newly modified applications may output data in XML format (instead of just printing reports for manual inspection,

for example). Nowhere does Ballantyne mention a service generating the results for the client. The modified applications (which the Examiner equates to a client) generates the results themselves after being modified by Ballantyne's system.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 2 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 3, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein generating the results data is performed in response to the client sending a request message in a data representation language to the service, wherein the request message requests the service to perform a function on behalf of the client, and wherein the function generates the results data when performed by the service. The Examiner cites columns 17 and 18 of Ballantyne. However, the cited passage does not mention anything regarding a client sending a message in a data representation language to a service. Nor does Ballantyne mention a service performing a function requested by such a message from a client, wherein the function generates the results data.

The Examiner refers to Ballantyne's discussion regarding how once legacy applications are modified to generate XML data the output from the modified applications may be stored in database and programmatically retrieved. Specifically, the Examiner refers to Ballantyne's description of how a user may receive their telephone bill via an e-mail that contains a link to a web site "that provides the individual's bill detail" (Ballantyne, column 17, lines 46-52). However, Ballantyne is discussing how the output from modified legacy applications may be stored and retrieved. Nowhere does Ballantyne mention results data being generated in response to a client sending a request in a data representation language. Instead, the results retrieval described by Ballantyne refers to retrieving results that were previously generated by a modified legacy application and stored in a database (see, e.g. Ballantyne, column 17, lines 15-24, and lines 62 – 67).

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 3 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Similar remarks as those above regarding claim 3 also apply to claims 25 and 36.

Regarding claim 4, in contrast the to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein the data representation language is eXtensible Markup Language (XML). The Examiner cites columns 17 and 18 of Ballantyne. However, nowhere in the cited passage (or anywhere else) does Ballantyne mention a client sending a request message in a data representation language to a service, wherein the data representation language is eXtensible Markup Language (XML). Instead, Ballantyne teaches using XML for output from modified legacy applications. Ballantyne's entire system is focused on automatically modifying the source code of legacy applications in directly output XML formatted data. Ballantyne does not refer to client sending request messages in XML (or any other data representation language).

The Examiner refers to Ballantyne's description regarding how after legacy applications are modified to output XML data, the outputted data can be stored for electronic retrieval, rather than manual retrieval and inspection of printed output previously generated by the legacy applications. However, Ballantyne is referring to request and retrieval of previously generated XML output. Please see the remarks above regarding claim 3 for a more detailed discussion of this argument. Ballantyne does not mention or describe a request message in a data representation language.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 4 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 5, Ballantyne fails to disclose a service in the distributed computing environment generating the results data prior to said accessing the results data, wherein accessing results data for a client in the distributed computing environment comprises receiving the results data from the service in one or more messages in a data representation language.

The Examiner cites column 17 of Ballantyne and refers to how report data in Ballantyne's system can be delivered in XML formatted billing statements or invoices. However, the cited portion of Ballantyne refers to the fact that once a legacy application has been modified to directly output XML formatted data, the output from the application may be more easily stored and retrieved than the original printed output from the unmodified legacy application. Nowhere does Ballantyne mention receiving the results data from a service in one or more messages in a data representation language.

Furthermore, Ballantyne does not mention anything about a service in the distributed computing environment generating the results data and sending the results data in one or more messages in a data representation language. The Examiner has not provided any argument nor cited any passage of Ballantyne that discloses such a service.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 5 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 6, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein generating the results data comprises the service storing the results data on a results space in the distributed computing environment. The Examiner fails to cite any portion of Ballantyne. Instead, the Examiner merely states, "the results data would be outputted to a space in a computing environment". However, Ballantyne fails to mention anything regarding a service storing the results data on a results space. Without any supporting passage from Ballantyne's teachings, the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 amounts to nothing more than the Examiner's own speculation regarding Ballantyne's system. In fact, Ballantyne fails to teach anything regarding a service storing results data on a results space. Instead, Ballantyne teaches that legacy applications may be modified to directly output data in XML format.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 6 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 7, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein accessing results data for a client in the distributed computing environment comprises accessing the results data from the results space. The Examiner fails to cite any portion of Ballantyne. Instead, the Examiner merely states (as with claim 6, discussed above), "the results data would be outputted to a space in a computing environment." However, Ballantyne fails to mention anything regarding a service storing the results data on a results space and further fails to mention anything about access the results data from a results space. Without any supporting passage from Ballantyne's teachings, the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 amounts to nothing more than the Examiner's own speculation regarding Ballantyne's system. In fact, Ballantyne fails to teach anything regarding storing or accessing results data on a results space. Instead, Ballantyne teaches that legacy applications may be modified to directly output data in XML format.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 7 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 9, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein the presentation schema is provided by the service, contrary to the Examiner's contention. The Examiner cites column 17, referring to Ballantyne's discussion of Electronic Bill Presentment and Payment and arguing that Ballantyne teaches that such services "provide the presentation schema used to generate the XML output." However, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Ballantyne. Specifically, Ballantyne does not teach that services provide presentation schemas. Instead, Ballantyne describes how in order to use Electronic Bill Presentment and Payment systems with typical legacy applications (not modified by Ballantyne's system) a parser must parse outputted invoice files. However, under Ballantyne's system, the legacy applications are modified to directly output XML format, thus providing data "in a recognized format for e-commerce" (Ballantyne, column 17, lines 37-52).

Thus, Ballantyne is not teaching that services provide presentation schemas, as argued by the Examiner. Instead, Ballantyne teaches that data in XML format outputted by modified legacy applications may be used in e-commerce applications (such as electronic bill payment) without requiring the use of a specialized parser. Nowhere does Ballantyne mention wherein the presentation schema is provided by the service.

Thus, the rejection of claim 9 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 11, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein the presentation schema advertisement is an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) document, in contrast to the Examiner's assertion. The Examiner argues, without citing any particular passage of Ballantyne, that "Ballantyne teaches that the output of the XML schema can be an XML document." Presumably, the Examiner is referring to how modified legacy applications in Ballantyne's system output XML formatted data. However, an application outputting XML formatted data is not the same as a presentation schema *advertisement* being an XML document. As described above, Ballantyne does not mention anything regarding presentation schema advertisements and further fails to disclose that a presentation schema advertisement is an XML document. The Examiner has not cited any portion of Ballantyne, and thus has not provided any support for the assertion that Ballantyne anticipates claim 11.

Furthermore, the rejection of claim 11 is improper because the Examiner relies on a second prior art reference (Sravanapudi) in the rejection of claim 10. Since claim 11 depends from claim 10, the Examiner cannot reject claim 11 under 102(e) in view of only Ballantyne.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 11 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Remarks similar to those above regarding claim 11 also apply to claims 29 and 51.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 8, 10, 27, 28 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 8 and contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne fails to teach or suggest providing a results advertisement for the results data on the results space, wherein the results advertisement includes information for enabling access of the results data. The Examiner cites column 17 of Ballantyne and argues that the XML formatted output of modified legacy applications "comprise invoices, billing statements, or any other type of report data including advertisement." The Examiner further states, "[a]lthough Ballantyne does not state 'advertisements', the term 'report data' could comprise an advertisement." However, claim 8 is not referring to traditional advertising content, but instead refers to a *results advertisement* that includes information for enabling access of the results data. Ballantyne does not teach or suggest anything regarding such a results advertisement that includes information for enabling access of the results data. Furthermore, the Examiner is referring to traditional advertising that may be part of the results data, not an advertisement *for the results data*, wherein the advertisement includes information for enabling access of the results data. The term "advertisement" is not used in the claims to mean a commercial or marketing advertisement. Instead, advertisement is defined in this claim as an advertisement *for the results data* that includes information for enabling access of the results data.

The Examiner further argues that it would have been obvious to produce advertisements as "result data" since an XML schema can be used to produce XML formatted data. Once again, the Examiner is referring to including traditional advertising content in the output from Ballantyne's modified legacy applications. Such traditional advertising has nothing to do with a results advertisement including information for enabling access of results data.

Furthermore, Ballantyne fails to teach or suggest accessing the results data from the results space in accordance with the results advertisement. **The Examiner has completely ignored this limitation of claim 8.**

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 8 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Remarks similar to those above regarding claim 8 also apply to claim 27.

Regarding claim 10, contrary to the Examiner's contention, Ballantyne fails to teach or suggest wherein the presentation schema is comprised in a presentation schema advertisement comprised on a storage device in the distributed computing environment, wherein the storage device is operable to store a plurality of presentation schema advertisements, and wherein accessing the presentation schema comprises access the presentation schema advertisement from the storage device through a space service.

The Examiner cites column 17 and argues that Ballantyne teaches providing results data in XML format and that XML data may comprise "invoices, billing statements, or any other type of report data including advertisement." The Examiner further argues, "[a]lthough Ballantyne does not state 'advertisements', the term 'report data' could comprise an advertisement. However, as noted above regarding claim 8, the Examiner is referring to traditional advertising content, which has nothing to do with a presentation schema advertisement.

Additionally, even if Ballantyne's XML output included a presentation schema advertisement (which Applicants maintain it does not) the Examiner has failed to show where Ballantyne teaches or suggests that such an advertisement could be used to generate the XML output (which the Examiner equates to presenting results data in accordance with a presentation schema). Following the Examiner's line of reasoning, one of Ballantyne's modified legacy applications would have to generate XML output that includes a presentation schema advertisement (even though Ballantyne doesn't teach

this) and access a schema via that presentation schema advertisement in order to generate the XML output (that was already output and included the schema advertisement) in accordance with the schema. Such an interpretation cannot be correct.

Furthermore, the Examiner has not mentioned or cited any portion of Ballantyne that teaches or suggests a presentation schema advertisement comprised on a storage device, wherein the storage device is operable to store a plurality of presentation schema advertisements. Nor does the Examiner mention or cite any portion of Ballantyne that teaches or suggests wherein accessing the presentation schema comprises access the presentation schema advertisement from the space device through a space service.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 10 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Remarks similar to those above regarding claim 10 also apply to claims 28 and 50.

The Office Action rejected claims 12, 30 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of Sravanapudi et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0049603) (hereinafter “Sravanapudi”). Applicants submit that claims 12, 30 and 52 are patentable for at least the reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims.

Applicants also assert that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejections of each of the independent claims have been shown to be improper, a further discussion of the rejections of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-57700/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: March 24, 2005